

## REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application and stand rejected. By the above amendment, claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections based on the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12, 15, 17-18 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,826,025 to Gramlich ("Gramlich"). At the very minimum, Gramlich is legally deficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22 are generally directed to systems and methods for constructing objects. The claimed inventions include *determining an order* for constructing objects based on *inclusion relationships* between an object and a fragment or inclusion relationships between a plurality of fragments. An object is then constructed using one or more fragments based on the *inclusion relationships* and the *determined order*. A fragment is an object that is a component of an object which is constructed using the fragment.

Examiner maintains that the "annotation overlays" of Gramlich are "*fragments*" of Web documents. Examiner further contends that "a fragment (within the possible context of document) can be fairly interpreted as any portion of any document." In the context of the claimed inventions, however, it is clear that a "annotation overlay" is not a fragment, that is, an object that is a component of an object which is constructed using the fragment, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 8, 15, 20 and 21. Indeed, Gramlich expressly teaches that "annotation overlays" are merely HTML files with directives that are used to modify the

content of Web documents (i.e., deleting, inserting text). These “annotation overlays” are documents that are parsed and interpreted by an AOP (annotation overlay proxy) to modify the content of a Web document (see, e.g., Col. 8, lines 35-39). The annotation overlays comprise “information fields” that allow an AOP (114) to perform a transformation on a part of a published Web document, including action field (4) and arg (5) fields that define an action to be taken by the AOP (114) when modifying a pattern (3) (or part) of the document. (See, Col. 8, line 54 - Col. 9, line 33).

In other words, the annotation overlays of Gramlich are not “fragments” - objects that are components of other objects, and which are used to construct such objects, much less objects that are included in objects based on inclusion relationships between objects and fragments, as essentially claimed in claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22. But rather, the “annotation overlays” are merely interpreted documents that are used to modify the content of a Web page. Based on the teachings of Applicants’ specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would not remotely consider an “annotation overlay” of Gramlich as a “fragment” or a component of an object or compound object.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22 are believed to be patentable and non-obvious over Gramlich. Further, claims 2-3, 5, 9-10, 12, 17-18 and 20 are believed to be patentable and non-obvious over Gramlich for at least the above reasons by virtue of the dependence of such claims from respective base claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22.

Further, claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 to Arora et al, claims 6, 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,144,962 to Weinberg, et al, claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,552 to Dozier, et al, and claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramlich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,855,015 to Shoham.

The above claim rejections are based, in part, on the contention that Gramlich discloses or suggests the inventions of base claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22. However, the cited combinations of references are believed to be legally deficient to establish a prima facie case of obvious because at the very minimum, as discussed above, Gramlich does not teach or suggest the elements of base claims 1, 8, 15, 21 and 22. For all the above reasons, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank DeRosa  
Reg. No. 43,584  
Attorney for Applicants

F. Chau & Associates, LLP  
1900 Hempstead Tnpk.  
East Meadow, NY 11553  
TEL.: (516) 357-0091  
FAX: (516) 357-0092